arXiv:1404.2111v3 [math.LO] 3 Jun 2015

Absoluteness via Resurrection

Giorgio Audrito, Matteo Viale

June 4, 2015

Abstract

The resurrection axioms are forms of forcing axioms that were introduced recently by Hamkins and Johnstone, developing on ideas of Chalons and Veličković. We introduce a stronger form of resurrection axioms (the *iterated* resurrection axioms) and show that they imply generic absoluteness for the first-order theory of $H_{\mathfrak{c}}$ with parameters with respect to various classes of forcings. We also show that the consistency strength of these axioms is below that of a Mahlo cardinal for most forcing classes, and below that of a stationary limit of supercompact cardinals for the class of stationary set preserving posets. We also compare these results with the generic absoluteness results by Woodin and the second author.

Contents

1 Introduction **2**
1.1 Notation 4
1.2 Second-order elementarity 5
1.3 Iterable forcing classes 8
1.4 Forcing axioms as density properties 9

2 Iterated resurrection and absoluteness **11**
2.1 Generic absoluteness 14

3 Uplifting cardinals **15**
3.1 Menas functions for uplifting cardinals 17

4 Consistency strength **19**
4.1 Lower bounds 19
4.2 Upper bounds 20
4.3 Iterated resurrection and CH 23

1 Introduction

It is a matter of fact that forcing is one of the most powerful tools to produce consistency results in set theory. Nonetheless a current theme of research in contemporary set theory seeks for extensions T of ZFC which turn forcing into a powerful instrument to prove theorems over T. This is done by showing that a statement ϕ follows from T if and only if T proves that ϕ is consistent by means of certain forcing notions.

These types of results are known in the literature as generic absoluteness results and have the general form of a completeness theorem for some $T \supseteq$ ZFC with respect to the semantic given by boolean valued models and first order calculus. More precisely generic absoluteness results fit within the following general framework:

> Assume T is an extension of ZFC, Θ is a family of first order formulas in the language of set theory and Γ is a certain class of forcing notions definable in T. Then the following are equivalent for a $\phi \in \Theta$ and $S \supseteq T$:
>
> 1. S proves ϕ.
> 2. S proves that there exists a forcing $P \in \Gamma$ such that P forces ϕ and T jointly.
> 3. S proves that P forces ϕ for all forcings $P \in \Gamma$ such that P forces T.

We refer the reader to the second author's papers [16, 17] for a detailed account on these type of results and for some motivation on the foundational role generic absoluteness can play in set theory. We say that a structure M definable in a theory T is generically invariant with respect to forcings in Γ and parameters in $X \subset M$ when the above situation occurs with Θ being the first order theory of M with parameters in X. A quick overview of the main known generic absoluteness results is the following:

- Shoenfield's absoluteness theorem is a generic absoluteness result for Θ the family of Σ^1_2-properties with real parameters, Γ the class of all forcings, $T =$ ZFC.
- The pioneering "modern" generic absoluteness results are Woodin's proofs of the invariance under set forcings of the first order theory of $L(\mathsf{ON}^\omega)$ with real parameters in ZFC + *class many Woodin cardinals which are limit of Woodin cardinals* [11, Thm. 3.1.2] and of the invariance under set forcings of the family of Σ^2_1-properties with real parameters in the theory ZFC + CH + *class many measurable Woodin cardinals* [11, Thm. 3.2.1].

Further results pin down the exact large cardinal strength of the assertion that $L(\mathbb{R})$ is generically invariant with respect to certain classes of forcings (among others see [13]).

- The bounded forcing axioms $\mathrm{BFA}(\Gamma)$ is equivalent to the statement that generic absoluteness holds for $T = \mathrm{ZFC}$ and Θ the class of Σ_1-formulas with parameters in $\mathcal{P}(\omega_1)$, as shown in [2].

- Recently Hamkins and Johnstone [6] introduced the resurrection axioms $\mathrm{RA}(\Gamma)$ and the second author [16] showed that these axioms produce generic absoluteness for Θ the Σ_2-theory with parameters of $H_{\mathfrak{c}}$, $T = \mathrm{ZFC} + \mathrm{RA}(\Gamma)$, Γ any of the standard classes of forcings closed under two step iterations.

- The second author introduced the forcing axiom MM^{+++} (a natural strenghtening of MM) and proved that $L(\mathsf{ON}^{\omega_1})$ with parameters in $P(\omega_1)$ is generically invariant with respect to SSP forcings for

$$T = \mathrm{ZFC} + \mathrm{MM}^{+++} + \text{there are class many superhuge cardinals.}$$

Motivated by the latter results as well as by the work of Tsaprounis [15], we expand on Hamkins and Johnstone's work [6] obtaining the following results:

- We introduce a new natural class of forcing axioms, the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ as Γ ranges among various classes of forcing notions and α runs through the ordinals, and prove the following generic absoluteness result over the theory MK (MK is the Morse-Kelley set theory with sets and classes) :

  Theorem. *Assume Γ is a definable class of set sized forcings in* MK. *Assume $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$ holds and $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ forces $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$, then $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V^{\mathsf{B}}}$.*

  This is a generic absoluteness result for $T = \mathrm{MK} + \mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$ and Θ the first order theory of $H_{\mathfrak{c}}$ with parameters. The use of MK instead of ZFC in this context is necessary since the iterated resurrection axioms $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ are second-order statements.

  We remark now (and we shall prove later) that these new axioms strengthen the resurrection axioms $\mathrm{RA}(\Gamma)$ introduced by Hamkins and Johnstone [6], and that for all α $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ follows from the axiom MM^{+++} introduced in [17].

- We show that the consistency strength of the axioms $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is below that of a Mahlo cardinal for all relevant Γ except for $\Gamma = \mathsf{SSP}$, in which case our upper bound is below a stationary limit of supercompact cardinals.

- Finally, a byproduct of our results is that the theory $T^* = \mathrm{MK} + \mathrm{RA}_\omega(\mathrm{all})$ is consistent relative to the existence of a Mahlo cardinals and makes the theory of projective sets of reals generically invariant with respect to any forcing which preserves T^*. Notice that T^* is consistent with the failure of projective determinacy. This shows that the request of generic absoluteness for the projective sets of reals (with respect to forcings preserving T^*) is much weaker than Woodin's generic absoluteness for all sets of reals in $L(\mathsf{R})$ with respect to $T = \mathrm{ZFC} + \textit{large cardinals}$.

Compared to the generic absoluteness result obtained in [17], the present results are weaker since they regard the structure $H_{\mathfrak{c}}$ instead of $L(\mathsf{ON}^{\omega_1})$. On the other hand, the consistency of $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is obtained from (in most cases much) weaker large cardinal hypothesis and the results are more general since they also apply to interesting choices of $\Gamma \neq \mathsf{SP}, \mathsf{SSP}$. Moreover (as we shall see below) the arguments we employ to prove the consistency of $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ for the $\Gamma \neq \mathsf{SSP}$ case are considerably simpler than the arguments developed in [17]. The proof of the consistency of $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ will instead rely on several results appearing in [17], even though we do not know if this is really necessary to handle this case.

The remaining part of Section 1 will recall some standard terminology and some well-known results needed in the latter part of this paper. Section 2 introduces the definitions of these new forcing axioms with their basic properties, and proves the main theorem. Section 3 develops the necessary technical devices for the consistency proofs of the axioms $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$. These proofs are carried over in section 4 adapting the consistency proofs for the resurrection axioms introduced in [6] to this new setting of iterated resurrection.

1.1 Notation

As in common set-theoretic use, $\mathcal{P}_\kappa(x)$, $\mathrm{trcl}(x)$, $\mathrm{rank}(x)$ will denote respectively the set of subsets of size less than κ, the transitive closure, and the rank of a given set x. The notation $f : A \to B$ will be improperly used to denote partial functions in $A \times B$. We shall use $s^\frown t$ for sequence concatenation and $s^\frown x$ where x is not a sequence as a shorthand to $s^\frown\langle x\rangle$. CH will denote the continuum hypothesis and $\mathfrak{c}$ the continuum itself.

Let $\mathcal{L}^2$ be the language of set theory with two sorts of variables, one for sets and one for classes. We will work with models of set theory with sets and classes and with theories in the language $\mathcal{L}^2$ extending the Gödel-Bernays system NBG and in most cases also the Morse-Kelley system MK (see [10, Sec. II.10] for the axioms of NBG and [1] for MK). We will identify a model $N = \langle \mathrm{set}(N), \mathrm{class}(N)\rangle$ of NBG with its underlying collection of classes $\mathrm{class}(N)$: e.g. if κ is inaccessible and $N = \langle V_\kappa, V_{\kappa+1}\rangle$, we shall just

denote N by $V_{\kappa+1}$. We recall that from the underlying collection class(N) we can reconstruct whether $x \in \text{set}(N)$ via the formula $\exists y \in \text{class}(N)\ x \in y$. We will use $M \prec_n N$ to denote that $(M, \in)$ is a Σ_n-elementary substructure of $(N, \in)$.

We shall follow Jech's approach [7] to forcing via boolean valued models. The letters B, C, $\mathsf{D}, \ldots$ will be used for set sized complete boolean algebras, $\mathsf{2}$ will be used for the two-valued boolean algebra, Γ will be used for definable classes of boolean algebras (such as σ-closed, ccc, $<\kappa$-cc, axiom-A, proper, SP (semiproper), SSP (stationary set preserving), presaturated towers). A definition of these properties can be found in [3, 4, 7].

We shall use V^{B} for the boolean valued model obtained from V and B, $\dot{x}$ for the elements (names) of V^{B}, $\check{x}$ for the canonical name for a set $x \in V$ in the boolean valued model V^{B}, $[\![\phi]\!]_{\mathsf{B}}$ for the truth value of the formula ϕ.

When convenient we shall also use the generic filters approach to forcing. The letters G, H will be used for generic filters over V, $\dot{G}_{\mathsf{B}}$ will denote the canonical name for the generic filter for B, $\text{val}_G(\dot{x})$ the valuation map on names by the generic filter G, $V[G]$ the generic extension of V by G. Let ϕ be a formula in $\mathcal{L}^2$. We shall write $V^{\mathsf{B}} \models \phi$ to denote that ϕ holds in all generic extensions $V[G]$ with G generic for B. We shall also write $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{B}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{C}}$ (and similarly $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{B}}$, $H_{\omega_2} \prec V^{\mathsf{B}}$) to denote that for all G V-generic for B and H $V[G]$-generic for C, $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G]} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G][H]}$.

$\mathsf{B}/_G$ will denote the quotient of a boolean algebra B by the ideal dual to the filter G, $\mathsf{B} * \dot{\mathsf{C}}$ will denote the usual two-step iteration: references are [7, 18]. $\text{Coll}(\alpha, \beta)$ is the Lévy collapse that generically adds a surjective function from α to β, $\text{Add}(\alpha, \beta)$ is the $<\alpha$-closed poset that generically adds β many subsets to α. In general we shall feel free to confuse a partial order with its boolean completion. When we believe that this convention may generate misunderstandings we shall be explicitly more careful.

Given an elementary embedding $j : V \to M$ with $M \subseteq V$, we will use $\text{crit}(j)$ to denote the critical point of j, and say that j is λ-supercompact iff ${}^{\lambda}M \subseteq M$, and that a cardinal κ is *supercompact* iff for every λ there exists a λ-supercompact elementary embedding with critical point κ. Our reference text for large cardinals is [8], while for forcing axioms is [4, Ch. 3].

1.2 Second-order elementarity and class games

Let T be a theory in the language $\mathcal{L}^2$ extending NBG that provably holds in $V_{\delta+1}$ with δ inaccessible. Let $\Delta_1^2(T)$ denote the formulae in $\mathcal{L}^2$ with set parameters that are provably equivalent modulo T both to a Σ_1^2 formula (i. e. a formula with one existential class quantifier and set parameters) and to a Π_1^2 formula (with one universal class quantifier and set parameters). Let N, M with $\text{set}(N) \subseteq \text{set}(M)$ be models of T. We will write $N \prec_{\Delta_1^2(T)} M$ to denote that all $\Delta_1^2(T)$ formulae with set parameters in N holding in N

also hold in M (and viceversa). We will write $N \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M$ for $N \prec_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M$ when $\mathrm{set}(N) = \mathrm{set}(M)$.

The $\Delta^2_1(T)$ formulae are interesting for their absolute behavior with respect to models of T with the same sets.

Proposition 1.1. *Let $N \subseteq M$ be models of a theory T extending* NBG *with the same sets. Then $N \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M$.*

Proof. Let $X = \mathrm{set}(N) = \mathrm{set}(M)$, and $\phi = \exists C\ \psi_1(C, \vec{p}) = \forall C\ \psi_2(C, \vec{p})$ be a $\Delta^2_1(T)$ formula, with $\vec{p} \in X$. Then,

$$\begin{array}{rl} N \models \phi & \Rightarrow \exists C \in N\ \langle X, C\rangle \models \psi_1(C, \vec{p}) \\ & \Rightarrow \exists C \in M\ \langle X, C\rangle \models \psi_1(C, \vec{p}) \Rightarrow \\ M \models \phi & \Rightarrow \forall C \in M\ \langle X, C\rangle \models \psi_2(C, \vec{p}) \\ & \Rightarrow \forall C \in N\ \langle X, C\rangle \models \psi_2(C, \vec{p}) \Rightarrow N \models \phi \end{array}$$

concluding the proof. □

Corollary 1.2. *Let T be a theory extending* NBG *that provably holds in $V_{\delta+1}$ with δ inaccessible. Let N, M be models of T with $\mathrm{set}(N) = \mathrm{set}(M) = V_\delta$, δ inaccessible. Then $N \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M$.*

Proof. Since δ is inaccessible, $V_{\delta+1}$ is a model of T containing both N, M hence by Lemma 1.1 $N \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} V_{\delta+1} \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M$. □

Corollary 1.2 tells us that for any inaccessible δ the truth value of a $\Delta^2_1(T)$-formula does not depend on the choice of the particular T-model whose family of sets is V_δ. Thus we will focus only on NBG-models of the kind $V_{\delta+1}$.

In the remainder of this paper we will need to prove that certain statements about class games are $\Delta^2_1(T)$ for a suitable theory T. In order to provide a definition of such a theory we now need to introduce clopen games on class trees. Our reference text for the basic notions and properties of games is [9, Sec. 20.A].

Recall that a tree T of height at most ω is a collection of finite sequences ordered by inclusion and closed under initial segments, and that a tree T is *well-founded* if it has no infinite chain (totally ordered subset). Given $s, t \in T$, let $s \lhd_T t$ denote that $t = s \restriction (|s| - 1)$ (t is obtained extending s with one more element).

The clopen game on the well-founded tree T is a two-player game $\mathcal{G}^T$ defined as follows: Player I starts with some $s_0 \in T$ of length 1, then each player has to play a $s_{n+1} \lhd_T s_n$. The last player who can move wins the game. A winning strategy σ for Player I in $\mathcal{G}^T$ is a subtree $\sigma \subseteq T$ such that for all $s \in \sigma$ of even length $|s|$ there is exactly one $t \in \sigma$ with $t \lhd_T s$, and for every $s \in \sigma$ of odd length, every $t \lhd_T s$ is in σ. A winning strategy for Player II is defined interchanging odd with even in the above statement.

A game $\mathcal{G}^T$ is determined if either one of the two players has a winning strategy.

We recall that there is correspondence between games $\mathcal{G}^T$ on a well-founded tree T and games on a pruned tree (as defined in [9]) whose winning condition is a clopen set. This justifies our terminology.

In the following we will be interested in the theory $T = \mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$, where $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ is the following axiom of determinacy for clopen class games:

Definition 1.3 ($\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$)**.** $\mathcal{G}^T$ is determined for any well-founded class tree T of height ω.

Games $\mathcal{G}^T$ on well-founded set trees $T \subseteq V_\delta$ are determined in ZFC (see [9, Thm. 20.1]) and the corresponding strategies $\sigma \subseteq T$ are elements of $V_{\delta+1}$. Thus the theory $\mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ holds in any $V_{\delta+1}$ with δ inaccessible, and we can apply the results of this section to this theory. Moreover, a finer upper bound for $\mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ is given by the next proposition (we thank Alessandro Andretta for pointing this fact to us).

Proposition 1.4. *The Morse-Kelley theory* MK *(with the axiom of global choice) implies* $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$*.*

Proof. Since the recursion theorem on well-founded class trees holds in MK (see [1, Prop. 2]), we can follow the classical ZFC proof of determinacy for clopen games $\mathcal{G}^T$ on well-founded set trees T.

For any $s \in T$ the next moving player is I if $|s| \bmod 2 = 0$ and II otherwise. Define recursively a (class) map $w : T \to 2$ so that $w(s) = |s| \bmod 2$ iff there exists a $t \lhd_T s$ such that $w(t) = |s| \bmod 2$. Intuitively, we can think of the map w as assigning (coherently) to every position s in $\mathcal{G}^T$ a "supposedly winning" player $w(s)$ (I if $|s| \bmod 2 = 0$ and II otherwise).

Then we can use the map w and the axiom of global choice to define a winning strategy σ for Player I if $w(\emptyset) = 0$, and for Player II if $w(\emptyset) = 1$. Precisely, define $T_w = \{s \in T : \ w(s) = w(\emptyset)\}$ and $s^+ = \min_{\lessdot} \{t \in T_w : \ t \lhd_T s\}$ where $\lessdot$ is a well-order on V. Then,

$$\sigma = \left\{ s \in T_w : \ \forall m < |s| \quad (m \bmod 2 = w(\emptyset)) \to \left(s \restriction (m+1) = (s \restriction m)^+ \right) \right\}$$

is the desired strategy. □

In the remainder of this paper we will focus on extensions of the theory $\mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ and use Δ^2_1 as a shorthand for the family of formulae $\Delta^2_1(\mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1))$. We remark that this theory is a natural strengthening of ZFC, since it asserts second order properties that are true for natural models of ZFC (models of the kind V_δ with δ inaccessible). Moreover, the theory has a reasonable consistency strength since it holds in all NBG models of the form $V_{\delta+1}$ with δ inaccessible and follows from MK.

It is not clear to us at the moment (and not so relevant for the purpose of this paper) whether the theory $\mathrm{NBG} + \mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ is preserved by set forcing. Since we know that this is true for MK (see [1, Thm. 23]), the most convenient theory to present and apply the following results is MK. In the remainder of this paper we shall feel free to implicitly assume MK when needed, while pointing out some passages where $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ is essentially used.

1.3 Iterable forcing classes

Our reference text for this section is [18]. Let $(P, \leq_P), (Q, \leq_Q)$ be partial orders. We recall that $P \subseteq Q$ is a suborder if the inclusion map of P into Q is preserving the order and the incompatibility relation. P is a complete suborder of Q if any maximal antichain in $(P, \leq_P)$ remains such in $(Q, \leq_Q)$. We shall feel free to confuse a partial order P with its boolean completion $\mathsf{RO}(P)$ and a boolean algebra B with the partial order B^+ given by its positive elements.

Definition 1.5. Let Γ be any definable class of complete boolean algebras closed under two step iterations and let B, C be complete boolean algebras.

We say that $\mathsf{B} \leq_\Gamma \mathsf{C}$ iff there is a complete homomorphism $i : \mathsf{C} \to \mathsf{B}$ such that the quotient algebra $\mathsf{B}/_{i[\dot{G}_\mathsf{C}]}$ is in Γ with boolean value 1_C. Notice that we do not require neither B nor C to be in Γ when $\mathsf{B} \leq_\Gamma \mathsf{C}$.

We say that $\mathsf{B} \leq^*_\Gamma \mathsf{C}$ iff there is a complete *injective* homomorphism with the same properties as above. If $\Gamma = \mathsf{SP}$, we further require that $\mathsf{B} \leq^*_\mathsf{SP} \mathsf{C}$ only if it is also the case that $\mathsf{B} \Vdash |\mathsf{C}| \leq \omega_1$.

The partial order $\leq^*_\Gamma$ allows us to summarize many results on iterated forcing by means of the following definition:

Definition 1.6. A definable class Γ of complete boolean algebras is *iterable* if and only if:

1. it is closed under two-step iterations and lottery sums;
2. given a $\leq^*_\Gamma$-descending sequence $\mathcal{B} = \langle \mathsf{B}_\alpha : \alpha < \gamma \rangle$ of complete boolean algebras in Γ, there is a (possibly not complete) suborder Q of $\varprojlim \mathcal{B}$ containing $\varinjlim \mathcal{B}$ as a suborder such that $\mathsf{RO}(Q) \in \Gamma$ is a lower bound for $\mathcal{B}$ in $\leq^*_\Gamma$;
3. if $\mathrm{cf}(\gamma) = \omega_1$, condition (2) holds for $Q = \varinjlim \mathcal{B}$.

Most notable cases for Γ are iterable: i.e, $\Gamma =$ all, locally ccc (lottery sums of ccc algebras), σ-closed, axiom-A, proper, semiproper. Conditions (2) and (3) are shown to hold for such classes Γ using respectively finite support (all, locally ccc), countable support (σ-closed, axiom-A, proper) and revised countable support (semiproper) iterations to find lower bounds for descending chains (see [3, 14, 18] for further details).

Definition 1.7. If Γ is iterable and $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ is a partial function, we define $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ the lottery iteration of Γ relative to f recursively as:

- $\mathsf{P}_0^{\Gamma,f} = 2$ the two-valued boolean algebra;
- $\mathsf{P}_{\alpha+1}^{\Gamma,f} = \mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f} * \dot{\mathsf{C}}$ if $f(\alpha)$ is undefined, where $\dot{\mathsf{C}}$ is a $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$-name for $\mathrm{Coll}(\omega_1, |\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}|)$ if $\Gamma = \mathsf{SP}$, and for 2 otherwise;
- $\mathsf{P}_{\alpha+1}^{\Gamma,f} = \mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f} * \dot{\mathsf{D}} * \dot{\mathsf{C}}$ if $f(\alpha)$ is defined, where $\dot{\mathsf{C}}$ is a $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f} * \dot{\mathsf{D}}$-name defined as above, and $\dot{\mathsf{D}}$ is a $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$-name for the lottery sum (as computed in $V^{\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}}$) of all complete boolean algebras in Γ of rank less than $f(\alpha)$;
- $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$ for α limit is obtained using the closure properties (2) or (3) of $\leq_\Gamma^*$ as in Definition 1.6.

The definition of iterable class of boolean algebras grants that this process can be done for any $f : \kappa \to \kappa$, obtaining an element of Γ at every stage. Notice that in principle there is a possible ambiguity in the choice of the limit $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$, due to the broadness of Definition 1.6.(2). Although, in all mentioned cases there is a canonical choice for this limit, which makes the object $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ unique.

The lottery iteration has been studied extensively by Hamkins [5] and has nice properties whenever f attains a sufficiently fast-growing behavior. We will employ these type of iterations in section 3.1. An important property of $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ that we will need is the following:

Theorem 1.8. *Let κ be an inaccessible cardinal, $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ a partial function, Γ iterable. Then $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ is $<\kappa$-cc.*

Proof. Since κ is inaccessible, for all $\alpha < \kappa$ we have that $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$ is in V_κ hence it is $<\kappa$-cc. Moreover, the set of $\alpha < \kappa$ such that $\mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f}$ is the direct limit includes all ordinals of cofinality ω_1, thus it is stationary. It follows from Baumgartner's [18, Thm. 3.13] that $\varinjlim \langle \mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f} : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ is $<\kappa$-cc.

By [18, Thm. 3.12], the direct limit of the system $\langle \mathsf{P}_\alpha^{\Gamma,f} : \alpha < \kappa \rangle$ coincides with the inverse limit, thus is the only possibility for $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$. We can conclude that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ is $<\kappa$-cc. □

1.4 Forcing axioms as density properties

The resurrection axiom, introduced by Hamkins in [6], can be concisely stated as a density property for the class partial order $\leq_\Gamma$ defined above.

Definition 1.9. The *resurrection axiom* $\mathrm{RA}(\Gamma)$ is the assertion that the class

$$\left\{ \mathsf{B} \in \Gamma : \quad H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{B}} \right\}$$

is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

The *weak resurrection axiom* wRA(Γ) is the assertion that for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$, there exists a $\mathsf{C} \leq_{\text{all}} \mathsf{B}$ such that $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{C}}$.

We shall reformulate in a similar way many of the common forcing axioms. We recall the standard definitions:

Definition 1.10. The bounded forcing axiom BFA(Γ) holds if for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ and all families $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ of predense subsets of B of size at most ω_1, there is a filter $G \subset \mathsf{B}$ meeting all these sets.

The forcing axiom FA(Γ) holds if for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ and all families $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ of predense subsets of B, there is a filter $G \subset \mathsf{B}$ meeting all these sets.

The forcing axiom FA^{++}(Γ) holds if for all $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ and all families $\{D_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ of predense subsets of B and all families $\{\dot{S}_\alpha : \alpha < \omega_1\}$ of B-names for stationary subsets of ω_1, there is a filter $G \subset \mathsf{B}$ meeting all these dense sets and evaluating each $\dot{S}_\alpha$ as a stationary subset of ω_1.

Theorem (Bagaria, [2])**.** BFA(Γ) *is equivalent to the assertion that the class*

$$\left\{\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma : \quad H_{\omega_2} \prec_1 V^{\mathsf{B}}\right\}$$

is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_{all})$.

We remark that the latter assertion is actually equivalent to requiring this class to coincide with the whole Γ (since Σ_1-formulas are always upwards absolute).

Under suitable large cardinal assumptions the unbounded versions of the forcing axioms can also be reformulated as density properties, but only for $\Gamma = \mathsf{SSP}$ (at least to our knowledge):

Theorem (Woodin, [11])**.** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then* MM *(i.e.* FA(SSP)*) is equivalent to the assertion that the class*

$$\{\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} : \quad \mathsf{B} \textit{ is a presaturated tower forcing}\}$$

is dense in $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{all})$.

Theorem (Viale, [17])**.** *Assume there are class many Woodin cardinals. Then* MM^{++} *(i.e.* FA^{++}(SSP)*) is equivalent to the assertion that the above class is dense in* $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$.

In this paper we shall also refer to the following strengthening of MM^{++}, which is defined by a density property of the class SSP as follows:

Definition 1.11 (Viale, [17])**.** MM^{+++} is the assertion that the class

$$\left\{\mathsf{B} \in \mathsf{SSP} : \quad \mathsf{B} \text{ is a strongly presaturated tower } {}^{1}\right\}$$

is dense in $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$.

[1] We refer the reader to [17, Def. 5.8] for a definition of strongly presaturated towers.

2 Iterated resurrection and absoluteness

Motivated by Hamkins and Johnstone's [6], as well as by Tsaprounis' [15], we introduce the following new class games and corresponding forcing axioms:

Definition 2.1. Let Γ be any definable class of forcing notions.

The Γ-weak resurrection game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ is as follows. Player I (*Kill*) plays couples (α_n, B_n) where α_n is an ordinal such that $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$ and B_n is such that $\mathsf{B}_{n+1} \leq_\Gamma \mathsf{C}_n$. Player II (*Resurrect*) plays boolean algebras C_n such that $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{C}_n} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{C}_{n+1}}$ and $\mathsf{C}_n \leq_{\mathrm{all}} \mathsf{B}_n$. The last player who can move wins.

The Γ-resurrection game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{RA}}$ is the same game as $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ with the additional requirement for Player II (*Resurrect*) to play so that $\mathsf{C}_n \leq_\Gamma \mathsf{B}_n$ for all n.

The Γ-strong resurrection game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{RFA}^{++}}$ is the same game as $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{RA}}$ with the further requirement for Player II (*Resurrect*) to play so that $V^{\mathsf{C}_n} \models \mathrm{FA}^{++}(\Gamma)$ for all n.



Definition 2.2. The *α-weak resurrection axiom* $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is the assertion that Player II (*Resurrect*) wins the Γ-weak resurrection game after $\langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$.

The *α-resurrection axiom* $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is the assertion that Player II (*Resurrect*) wins the Γ-resurrection game after $\langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$.

The *α-strong resurrection axiom* $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is the assertion that Player II (*Resurrect*) wins the Γ-strong resurrection game after $\langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$.

We say that $\mathrm{wRA}_{\mathsf{ON}}(\Gamma)$ (respectively $\mathrm{RA}_{\mathsf{ON}}(\Gamma)$, $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_{\mathsf{ON}}(\Gamma)$) holds iff the corresponding axioms hold for all $\alpha \in \mathsf{ON}$.

Note that all these games are clopen class games, since Player I plays descending sequences of ordinals. Thus the corresponding axioms are Δ^2_1 statements expressible in $\mathcal{L}^2$. A posteriori these axioms can also be formulated in recursive terms, as we will see in the next proposition. However, this type of formulation cannot be directly used as a definition in $\mathcal{L}^2$. In fact, the defining formula according to the next proposition would involve a recursion on α which adds quantifiers as α grows, so that the natural syntactic expression of the α-th iterated resurrection axiom defined in recursive terms is not a first order formula in the language $\mathcal{L}^2$ for any infinite α. This is the main motivation which led us to introduce the class-game formulation of the iterated resurrection axioms and to work with set theories which are axiomatizable in $\mathcal{L}^2$.

Proposition 2.3 ($\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$)**.** $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *holds iff for all $\beta < \alpha$ and $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ there is a $\mathsf{C} \leq_{all} \mathsf{B}$ such that $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{C}}$ and $V^{\mathsf{C}} \models \mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$.*

$\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *holds iff the same holds with* $\mathsf{C} \leq_\Gamma \mathsf{B}$*; or equivalently for all* $\beta < \alpha$ *the class*

$$\left\{\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma : \quad H_\mathfrak{c} \prec H^{\mathsf{B}}_\mathfrak{c} \wedge V^{\mathsf{B}} \models \mathrm{RA}_\beta(\Gamma)\right\}$$

is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Similarly, $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *holds iff for all* $\beta < \alpha$ *the class*

$$\left\{\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma : \quad H_\mathfrak{c} \prec H^{\mathsf{B}}_\mathfrak{c} \wedge V^{\mathsf{B}} \models \mathrm{FA}^{++}(\Gamma), \mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\beta(\Gamma)\right\}$$

is dense in $(\Gamma, \leq_\Gamma)$.

Proof. First we prove that for any C, $\mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ holds in V^{C} iff Player II (*Resurrect*) wins $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ in V after $\langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$. Let G be V-generic for C and $\mathsf{D} \leq_{\mathrm{all}} \mathsf{C}$ with witnessing map $i : \mathsf{C} \to \mathsf{D}$ (i being the identity for $\mathsf{D} = \mathsf{C}$), and define $\mathsf{D}_G := \mathsf{D}/_{i[G]}$ in $V[G]$. Let s be in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ extending $\langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$ and define s_G as the sequence obtained by substituting every boolean algebra D appearing in s with D_G. By $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$, let σ be a winning strategy for player I or II in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ after $\langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$. Then $\sigma_G = \{s_G : \ s \in \sigma\}$ is a winning strategy for the same player in the corresponding game in $V[G]$ after $\langle(\beta, 2), 2\rangle$. It follows that $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}} \restriction \langle(\beta, 2), 2\rangle$ is determined in $V[G]$ and Player II (*Resurrect*) wins iff he wins the corresponding game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}} \restriction \langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$ in V.

Next we observe that whenever there is a winning strategy σ for player I or II in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ and $s = \langle(\alpha, 2), 2, (\beta, \mathsf{B}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$ is in σ, we can define a winning strategy for the same player $\sigma_s = \left\{\langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle^\frown u : \ s^\frown u \in \sigma\right\}$ in the game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}} \restriction \langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$.

Now we can prove the proposition: suppose that $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ holds, and fix $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$. Let σ be a winning strategy for Player II (*Resurrect*) in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ after $s_0 = \langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$. Then $s_1 = s_0^\frown(\beta, \mathsf{B}) \in \sigma$ and there is exactly one $s_2 \lhd_{\mathrm{wRA}} s_1$ in σ, $s_2 = s_1^\frown \mathsf{C}$ with $\mathsf{C} \leq_{\mathrm{all}} \mathsf{B}$ and $H^2_\mathfrak{c} = H_\mathfrak{c} \prec H^{\mathsf{C}}_\mathfrak{c}$. Moreover, σ_{s_2} is a winning strategy for Player II (*Resurrect*) in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ after $\langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$, thus $\mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ holds in V^{C}.

Conversely, suppose that for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ there is a C such that $\mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ holds in V^{C} and $H_\mathfrak{c} \prec H^{\mathsf{C}}_\mathfrak{c}$. Assume towards a contradiction that $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ fails. Then by $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ Player I (*Kill*) has a winning strategy σ in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ after $s_0 = \langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$, and there is exactly one $s_1 = s_0^\frown(\beta, \mathsf{B}) \in \sigma$. Let C be such that $\mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ holds in V^{C}, $H_\mathfrak{c} \prec H^{\mathsf{C}}_\mathfrak{c}$. Then $s_2 = s_1^\frown \mathsf{C}$ is a valid move (hence is in σ) and by the first part of this proof, since $V^{\mathsf{C}} \models \mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$, Player II (*Resurrect*) wins the game $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}} \restriction \langle(\beta, \mathsf{C}), \mathsf{C}\rangle$. Since σ_{s_2} is a winning strategy for Player I (*Kill*) in the same game, we get a contradiction.

Similar arguments yield the thesis also for $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$, $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma)$. □

From now on, we will stick to the latter recursive formulation in order to prove the main results by induction on α, thus implicitly assuming $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$. The same will be done with the subsequent definitions 3.1, 3.5, 3.8 of other class games.

By Proposition 2.3, $\mathrm{wRA}_0(\Gamma)$, $\mathrm{RA}_0(\Gamma)$ hold vacuously true for any Γ. Thus $\mathrm{wRA}_1(\Gamma)$, $\mathrm{RA}_1(\Gamma)$ imply the non-iterated formulations of resurrection axioms given in [6].

These different forcing axioms defined above are connected by the following implications:

- if $\beta < \alpha$, $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma) \Rightarrow \mathrm{wRA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ (same with RA, RFA^{++}),
- if $\Gamma_1 \subseteq \Gamma_2$, $\mathrm{wRA}(\Gamma_2) \Rightarrow \mathrm{wRA}(\Gamma_1)$,
- $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma) \Rightarrow \mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma) \Rightarrow \mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ whenever Γ is closed under two step iterations: for the latter implication notice that the winning strategy σ for II in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{RA}}$ starting from $\langle(\alpha, 2), 2\rangle$ can also be used in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$ and will force I to play always a B_n in Γ. In particular σ will remain a winning strategy also in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{wRA}}$.

We shall be mainly interested in $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$, even though $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ will be convenient to state theorems in a modular form (thanks to its monotonous behavior with respect to Γ), and $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ will be convenient to handle the $\Gamma = \mathsf{SSP}$ case.

Some implications can be drawn between iterated resurrection axiom and the usual forcing axioms, as shown in the following theorems.

Theorem 2.4. $\mathrm{wRA}_1(\Gamma) + \neg\,\mathrm{CH}$ *implies* $\mathrm{BFA}(\Gamma)$.

Proof. We shall prove the formulation of $\mathrm{BFA}(\Gamma)$ as a density property given in Section 1.4 from the recursive formulation of $\mathrm{wRA}_1(\Gamma)$ given in Proposition 2.3.

Let B be any boolean algebra in Γ, and $\mathsf{C} \leq_{\mathrm{all}} \mathsf{B}$ be such that $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H^{\mathsf{C}}_{\mathfrak{c}}$. Since $\neg\,\mathrm{CH}$ holds, we have that $\mathfrak{c} \geq \omega_2$ hence in particular $H_{\omega_2} \prec H^{\mathsf{C}}_{\omega_2}$. By Levy's absoluteness $H^{\mathsf{C}}_{\omega_2} \prec_1 V^{\mathsf{C}}$. This concludes the proof. □

Theorem 2.5. *Assume there are class many super huge cardinals. Then* MM^{+++} *implies* $\mathrm{RA}_{\mathsf{ON}}(\mathsf{SSP})$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on α. For $\alpha = 0$ it is trivial, suppose now that $\alpha > 0$ and the Theorem holds for all $\beta < \alpha$.

Let A be the class of all super huge cardinals in V. Since A is a proper class, by [17, Thm. 3.6, Thm 3.10] the class $\{\mathbb{U}_\delta : \delta \in A\}$ is predense in $(\mathsf{SSP}, \leq_{\mathsf{SSP}})$. Moreover $H_{\omega_2} \prec H^{\mathbb{U}_\delta}_{\omega_2}$ for all $\delta \in A$, since (By [17, Lemma 5.19]) $\mathbb{U}_\delta$ is forcing equivalent to a (strongly) presaturated tower for any such δ. Moreover, by [17, Cor. 5.20], every such $\mathbb{U}_\delta$ forces MM^{+++} and that there are class many super huge cardinals (since large cardinals are

indestructible by small forcing). It follows by inductive hypothesis that every such $\mathbb{U}_\delta$ forces $\mathrm{RA}_\beta(\mathsf{SSP})$ for any $\beta < \alpha$ as well, hence $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ holds in V. □

2.1 Resurrection axioms and generic absoluteness

The main motivation for the iterated resurrection axioms can be found in the following result:

Theorem 2.6. *Suppose* $n \in \omega$, $\mathrm{RA}_n(\Gamma)$ *holds and* $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ *forces* $\mathrm{RA}_n(\Gamma)$. *Then* $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec_n H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{B}}$.

Proof. We proceed by induction on n. If $n = 0$, the thesis follows by the fact that all transitive structures $M \subset N$ are Σ_0-elementary. Suppose now that $n > 0$, and fix G V-generic for B. By Proposition 3.2 and $\mathrm{RA}_n(\Gamma)$, let $\mathsf{C} \in V[G]$ be such that whenever H is $V[G]$-generic for C, $V[G*H] \models \mathrm{RA}_{n-1}(\Gamma)$ and $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G*H]}$. Then we have the following diagram:

$$\begin{array}{ccc} H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V & \xrightarrow{\Sigma_\omega} & H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G*H]} \\ & {\scriptstyle\Sigma_{n-1}}\searrow \quad \nearrow{\scriptstyle\Sigma_{n-1}} & \\ & H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G]} & \end{array}$$

obtained by inductive hypothesis applied both on V, $V[G]$ and on $V[G]$, $V[G*H]$ since in all those classes $\mathrm{RA}_{n-1}(\Gamma)$ holds.

Let $\phi = \exists x \psi(x)$ be any Σ_n formula with parameters in $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V$. First suppose that ϕ holds in V, and fix $\bar{x} \in V$ such that $\psi(\bar{x})$ holds. Since $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V \prec_{n-1} H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G]}$ and ψ is Π_{n-1}, it follows that $\psi(\bar{x})$ holds in $V[G]$ hence so does ϕ. Now suppose that ϕ holds in $V[G]$ as witnessed by $\bar{x} \in V[G]$. Since $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G]} \prec_{n-1} H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G*H]}$ it follows that $\psi(\bar{x})$ holds in $V[G*H]$, hence so does ϕ. Since $H_{\mathfrak{c}}^V \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{V[G*H]}$, the formula ϕ holds also in V concluding the proof. □

Corollary 2.7. *Assume* $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$ *holds and* $\mathsf{B} \in \Gamma$ *forces* $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$. *Then* $H_{\mathfrak{c}} \prec H_{\mathfrak{c}}^{\mathsf{B}}$.

A similar absoluteness result for $L(\mathsf{ON}^{\omega_1})$ concerning SSP forcings in the MM^{+++} setting was previously obtained in [17]. Corollary 2.7 provides a weaker statement (since it concerns the smaller model $H_{\mathfrak{c}}$) while being more general, since it holds also for $\Gamma \neq \mathsf{SSP}$ and is compatible with CH. It must also be noted that the consistency of $\mathrm{RA}_\omega(\Gamma)$ follows from much weaker large cardinal assumptions than the principle MM^{+++} needed to prove absoluteness for $L(\mathsf{ON}^{\omega_1})$.

3 Uplifting cardinals and definable Menas functions

In order to measure the consistency strength of the α-resurrection axiom, we need to introduce the following large cardinal notion.

Definition 3.1. The *uplifting game* $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{UP}}$ is as follows. Player I (*challenge*) plays couples of ordinals (α_n, θ_n) such that $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$. Player II (*uplift*) plays regular cardinals κ_n such that $V_{\kappa_n+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\kappa_{n+1}+1}$, $\kappa_n \geq \theta_n$. The last player who can move wins.



We say that κ is (α)-uplifting iff Player II (*Uplift*) wins the uplifting game after $\langle(\alpha, 0), \kappa\rangle$. We say that κ is (ON)-uplifting iff it is (α)-uplifting for all $\alpha \in \mathsf{ON}$.

The uplifting game is a clopen class game, since Player I (*Challenge*) plays a descending sequence of ordinals. It follows that upliftingness is a Δ^2_1-property. As for the iterated resurrection axioms, we can give a formulation in recursive terms.

Proposition 3.2 ($\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$)**.** *κ is (α)-uplifting iff it is regular and for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \kappa$ there is a $\lambda > \theta$ that is (β)-uplifting and $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\lambda+1}$.*

Proof. Follows the one of Proposition 2.3. Let σ be a winning strategy for player I or II in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{UP}}$ and $s = \langle(\alpha, 0), \kappa, (\beta, \theta), \lambda\rangle$ be in σ. Then $\sigma_s = \left\{\langle(\beta, 0), \lambda\rangle^\frown u : \ s^\frown u \in \sigma\right\}$ is a winning strategy for the same player in $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{UP}} \restriction \langle(\beta, 0), \lambda\rangle$. Then we can follow step by step the last part of the proof of Proposition 2.3 using the reduction $\sigma \to \sigma_s$ defined above. □

Note that replacing "regular" with "inaccessible" in Definition 3.1 would produce no difference for $\alpha > 0$, since no successor cardinal κ can satisfy $V_\kappa \prec V_\lambda$ with $\lambda > \kappa$. However, the formulation hereby chosen for Definition 3.1 is more convenient for the proofs in section 4.

We remark that the definition of (0)-uplifting cardinal overlaps with that of a regular cardinal. Although similar, the class of (1)-uplifting cardinals does not coincide with the class of *uplifting cardinals* as defined by Johnstone and Hamkins in [6]. In fact, being (1)-uplifting is a stronger property than being *uplifting*, since the family of Δ^2_1-formulae for the MK-model $V_{\kappa+1}$ strictly includes all formulae in the language of set theory with parameters in V_κ. However, the consistency strength of (ON)-uplifting cardinals is close to that of uplifting cardinals, as shown in Proposition 3.4 below.

We remark that if a cardinal is (α)-uplifting in V it is (α)-uplifting also in L, and if $\alpha > 0$ it is also Σ_3-reflecting. Hence the least supercompact (if it exists) is below the least (1)-uplifting.

Lemma 3.3. *Assume δ is Mahlo. Then there are stationarily many inaccessible $\gamma < \delta$ such that $V_{\gamma+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\delta+1}$.*

Proof. Let $C \subseteq \delta$ be a club, M_0 be the Skolem hull of $\{C\}$ in $V_{\delta+1}$. Define a sequence $\langle M_\alpha, \gamma_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ where $\gamma_\alpha = \max(\alpha, \mathrm{rank}(M_\alpha \cap V_\delta))$, $M_{\alpha+1} \prec V_{\delta+1}$ is obtained by Lowenheim-Skolem Theorem from $M_\alpha \cup V_{\gamma_\alpha}$, and $M_\alpha = \bigcup_{\beta<\alpha} M_\beta$ for α limit ordinal.

Since $M_\alpha < \delta$ implies that $\gamma_\alpha < \delta$ and $|M_{\alpha+1}| = |M_\alpha \cup V_{\gamma_\alpha}| < \delta$, by induction on α we have that $|M_\alpha|, \gamma_\alpha < \delta$ for all α. Furthermore, the sequence $\langle \gamma_\alpha : \alpha < \delta\rangle$ is a club on δ, which is Mahlo, thus we can find an $\bar\alpha < \delta$ limit such that $\gamma_{\bar\alpha}$ is inaccessible.

Since $\bar\alpha$ is limit, $M_{\bar\alpha} \cap V_\delta = V_{\gamma_\alpha}$. Since $V_{\delta+1} \models C$ is a club and $M_{\bar\alpha} \prec V_{\delta+1}$, $C \in M_{\bar\alpha}$, also $M_{\bar\alpha} \models C$ is a club hence $\gamma_{\bar\alpha}$ is a limit point of C. Thus, $\gamma_{\bar\alpha}$ is an inaccessible cardinal in C and by Corollary 1.2 $V_{\gamma_{\bar\alpha}+1} \equiv_{\Delta^2_1(T)} M_{\bar\alpha} \prec V_{\delta+1}$, concluding the proof. □

Proposition 3.4. *Assume δ is Mahlo. Then $V_{\delta+1}$ models* MK + *there are class many* (ON)*-uplifting cardinals.*

Proof. Since δ is inaccessible, $V_{\delta+1}$ models MK. Furthermore,

$$S = \left\{\kappa < \delta : \ \kappa \text{ inaccessible } \wedge \ V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\delta+1}\right\}$$

is stationary by Lemma 3.3. We prove that every element of S is (α)-uplifting in $V_{\delta+1}$ by induction on $\alpha < \delta$.

First, every element of S is (0)-uplifting by definition. Suppose now that every element of S is (β)-uplifting for every $\beta < \alpha$, and let κ be in S. Since S is unbounded, for every $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \kappa$ in V_δ there is a $\gamma \in S$, $\gamma > \theta$. Such γ is (β)-uplifting by inductive hypothesis and $V_{\kappa+1}, V_{\gamma+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\delta+1}$ implies that $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1}$. We can now use Property 3.2 to conclude. □

As shown in [6, Thm. 11], if there is an uplifting cardinal then there is a transitive model of ZFC + ON is Mahlo. So the existence of an (ON)-uplifting cardinal is in consistency strength strictly between the existence of a Mahlo cardinal and the scheme "ON is Mahlo". We take these bounds to be rather close together and low in the large cardinal hierarchy.

To achieve a consistency result also for RFA^{++}, we need to introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.5. The *uplifting for supercompacts game* $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{UP}^{++}}$ is the same game as $\mathcal{G}^{\mathrm{UP}}$ (see Definition 3.1) with the additional requirement that Player II (*Uplift*) has to play supercompact cardinals.

We say that κ is (α)-uplifting for supercompacts iff it is supercompact and Player II (*Uplift*) wins the uplifting for supercompacts game after $\langle(\alpha, 0), \kappa\rangle$. We say that κ is (ON)-uplifting for supercompacts iff it is (α)-uplifting for supercompacts for all $\alpha \in \mathsf{ON}$.

Proposition 3.6 ($\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$)**.** *κ is (α)-uplifting for supercompacts iff it is supercompact and for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \kappa$ there is a $\lambda > \theta$ that is (β)-uplifting for supercompacts and $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\lambda+1}$.*

Proof. Follows the one of Proposition 3.2. □

A bound for this large cardinal notion can be obtained in a completely similar way to Proposition 3.4:

Proposition 3.7. *There are class many (ON)-uplifting for supercompacts cardinals consistently relative to a stationary limit of supercompact cardinals.*

3.1 Menas functions for uplifting cardinals

As previously mentioned, to obtain the consistency results at hand we shall use a lottery iteration relative to a fast-growing function $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ for a sufficiently large cardinal κ. The exact notion of fast-growth we will need is given by the *Menas* property schema introduced in [12] and developed by Hamkins for several different cardinal notions in [5, 6].

We remark that it is always possible to define Menas functions for cardinals that have a Laver function, while it is also possible to define such functions for some cardinals that don't have a Laver function; obtaining from these Menas functions many of the interesting consequences given by Laver functions.

Definition 3.8. The *Menas uplifting game* $\mathcal{G}^{M-\mathrm{UP}}$ is as follows. Player I (*Challenge*) plays couples of ordinals (α_n, θ_n) such that $\alpha_{n+1} < \alpha_n$. Player II (*Uplift*) plays partial functions $f_n : \kappa_n \to \kappa_n$ with κ_n regular cardinal such that[2] $\langle V_{\kappa_n+1}, f_n\rangle \prec_{\Delta^2_1} \langle V_{\kappa_{n+1}+1}, f_{n+1}\rangle$ and $f_{n+1}(\kappa_n) \geq \theta_{n+1}$. The last player who can move wins.



We say that a partial function $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ is Menas for (α)-uplifting iff Player II (*Uplift*) wins the Menas uplifting game after $\langle(\alpha, 0), f\rangle$. We say that f is Menas for (ON)-uplifting iff it is Menas for (α)-uplifting for all $\alpha \in \mathsf{ON}$.

[2] $\langle M, C\rangle \prec_{\Delta^2_1} \langle N, D\rangle$ iff $\mathrm{set}(M) \subseteq \mathrm{set}(N)$ and for all Δ^2_1-properties $\phi(\vec{x}, Y)$ with $\vec{x}$ a tuple of set variables and Y a class variable, $\langle M, C\rangle \models \phi(\vec{a}, C)$ iff $\langle N, D\rangle \models \phi(\vec{a}, D)$.

Proposition 3.9 ($\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$)**.** *A partial function $f : \kappa \to \kappa$ is Menas for (α)-uplifting iff κ is regular and for all $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \kappa$ there is a Menas for (β)-uplifting function $g : \lambda \to \lambda$ with $g(\kappa) > \theta$ and $\langle V_{\kappa+1}, f\rangle \prec_{\Delta^2_1} \langle V_{\lambda+1}, g\rangle$.*

Proof. Follows the one of Proposition 3.2. □

In order to prove the existence of a definable Menas function for (α)-uplifting cardinals, we first need to outline some reflection properties of these cardinals.

Lemma 3.10. *Let κ be an (α)-uplifting cardinal with $\alpha < \kappa$, and $\delta < \kappa$ be an ordinal. Then (δ is (α)-uplifting)$^{V_\kappa}$ iff it is (α)-uplifting.*

Proof. Let $\phi(\alpha)$ be the statement of this theorem, i.e:

$$\forall \kappa > \alpha\ (\alpha)\text{-uplifting}\ \forall \delta < \kappa\ \Big((\delta \text{ is } (\alpha)\text{-uplifting})^{V_\kappa} \Leftrightarrow \delta \text{ is } (\alpha)\text{-uplifting}\Big)$$

We shall prove $\phi(\alpha)$ by induction on α using the recursive formulation given by Proposition 3.2. For $\alpha = 0$ it is easily verified, suppose now that $\alpha > 0$.

For the forward direction, suppose that (δ is (α)-uplifting)$^{V_\kappa}$, and let $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \delta$ be ordinals. Let $\lambda > \theta$ be a (β)-uplifting cardinal with $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\lambda+1}$, so that ($\delta$ is (α)-uplifting)$^{V_\lambda}$ since upliftingness is a Δ^2_1-property under $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ (and $\mathrm{AD}(\Delta^0_1)$ holds at inaccessible cardinals). Then there is a $\gamma > \theta$ in V_λ with $V_{\delta+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1}$ and (γ is (β)-uplifting)$^{V_\lambda}$. By inductive hypothesis, since $\beta < \alpha$ and λ is (β)-uplifting in V, also γ is (β)-uplifting in V concluding this part.

Conversely, suppose that δ is (α)-uplifting in V and let $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \delta$ be ordinals in V_κ. Let $\gamma > \theta$ be a (β)-uplifting cardinal such that $V_{\delta+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1}$, and let $\lambda > \gamma$ be a (β)-uplifting cardinal such that $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\lambda+1}$. By inductive hypothesis, since $\beta < \alpha$ and γ, λ are (β)-uplifting in V, (γ is (β)-uplifting)$^{V_\lambda}$, thus

$$V_{\lambda+1} \models \exists \gamma > \theta\ V_{\delta+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1} \wedge \gamma \text{ is } (\beta)\text{-uplifting}.$$

By Δ^2_1-elementarity, $V_{\kappa+1}$ models the same concluding the proof. □

Proposition 3.11. *If κ is (α)-uplifting, then there is a Menas function for (α)-uplifting on κ.*

Proof. We shall prove by induction on α that whenever κ is (α)-uplifting, such a function is given by the following definition (failure of upliftingness function) relativized to $V_{\kappa+1}$:

$$f(\xi) = \sup\Big\{\gamma :\ V_{\xi+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1}\ \wedge \\ \exists \beta\ \gamma \text{ is } (\beta)\text{-uplifting}\ \wedge\ \xi \text{ is not } (\beta+1)\text{-uplifting}\}$$

Note that $f(\xi)$ is undefined only if ξ is (ON)-uplifting (in the domain of f), since otherwise ξ would be an element considered in the supremum. Thus $f(\xi) \geq \xi$ when it is defined.

If κ is (0)-uplifting any function $g : \kappa \to \kappa$ is Menas, in particular our f. Now suppose that κ is (α)-uplifting with $\alpha > 0$ and let $\beta < \alpha$, $\theta > \kappa$ be ordinals. Let $\gamma > \theta$ be a (β)-uplifting cardinal such that $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma+1}$, and let λ be the least (β)-uplifting cardinal bigger than γ such that $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\lambda+1}$.

Thus no $\gamma' \in (\gamma, \lambda)$ with $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta^2_1} V_{\gamma'+1}$ can be (β)-uplifting in V, hence by Lemma 3.10 neither in V_λ. It follows that κ cannot be $(\beta+1)$-uplifting in V_λ, while again by Lemma 3.10 it is (β)-uplifting in V_λ. Then any γ' considered in calculating $f^{V_{\lambda+1}}(\kappa)$ must be witnessed by a $\beta' \geq \beta$ (since κ is $(\beta'+1)$-uplifting in $V_{\lambda+1}$ for any $\beta' < \beta$) hence be (β)-uplifting.

It follows that $f^{V_{\lambda+1}}(\kappa) = \gamma$ and $\langle V_{\kappa+1}, f^{V_{\kappa+1}}\rangle \prec_{\Delta^2_1} \langle V_{\lambda+1}, f^{V_{\lambda+1}}\rangle$ since f is Δ^2_1-definable, concluding the proof. □

4 Consistency strength

The results of this section expand on the ones already present in [6] and [17]. In the previous section we outlined the large cardinal properties we shall need for our consistency proofs. Now we shall apply the machinery developed by Hamkins and Johnstone in their proof of the consistency of $\mathrm{RA}(\Gamma)$ for various classes of Γ, and we will show that with minor adjustments their techniques will yield the desired consistency results for $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ for all $\Gamma \neq \mathsf{SSP}$ when applied to lottery preparation forcings guided by suitable Menas functions. To prove the consistency of $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ we will instead employ the technology introduced by the second author in [17].

For this reason we shall feel free to sketch most of the proofs, leaving to the reader to check the details, that can be developed in analogy to what is done in [6] and [17].

4.1 Lower bounds

Theorem 4.1. *If* $\mathrm{wRA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *holds for* $\Gamma = \{\mathrm{Coll}(\omega_1, \beta) : \beta \in \mathsf{ON}\}$ *and* CH *fails, then* $\mathfrak{c}^V$ *is* (α)*-uplifting in* L*.*

Proof. The proof is obtained by induction on α, following [6, Thm. 16] with minor adjustments. □

Notice than the same result will hold also for any bigger Γ (as σ-closed, axiom-A, proper, semiproper, SSP).

Theorem 4.2. *If* $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *holds for* $\Gamma =$*all, ccc then* $\mathfrak{c}^V$ *is* (α)*-uplifting in* L*.*

Proof. The proof is obtained by induction on α, following [6, Thm. 16] with minor adjustments. □

4.2 Upper bounds

In this section we shall prove that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$, the lottery iteration of Γ relative to a function $f : \kappa \to \kappa$, forces $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ whenever f is Menas for (α)-uplifting. In order to prove this result, we will need to ensure that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ "behaves well" as a class forcing with respect to V_κ.

There are two possible approaches. In the first one, we can consider $\langle V_\kappa, f\rangle$ as a ZFC model extended with an additional unary predicate for f, so that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ can be handled as a definable class forcing. Thus we can proceed following step by step the analogous argument carried out in [6]. In the second one, we can consider the MK model $V_{\kappa+1}$ and expand on the results in [1] to prove that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ preserve enough of MK and behaves well with respect to elementarity. Even though the second approach is more general and natural in some sense, the first approach is considerably simpler. Thus we will follow the argument in [6] and give the following definition.

Definition 4.3. Let $\langle M, C\rangle$ be a model of ZFC expanded with an additional class predicate C, and P be a class partial order definable in $\langle M, C\rangle$.

An $\langle M, C\rangle$-generic filter G for P is a filter meeting all dense subclasses of P which are definable in $\langle M, C\rangle$ with parameters.

P is *nice for forcing* in $\langle M, C\rangle$ if the forcing relation $\Vdash_{\mathsf{P}}$ is definable in $\langle M, C\rangle$ and the forcing theorem holds, i.e. for every first-order formula ϕ with parameters in $\langle M, C\rangle$ and every $\langle M, C\rangle$-generic filter G for P,

$$\langle M[G], C\rangle \models \phi \;\Leftrightarrow\; \exists p \in G\ M \models (p \Vdash_{\mathsf{P}} \phi)\,.$$

Note that the definition is interesting only when $\mathsf{P} \notin M$ is a class forcing with respect to M. The next lemmas provide a sufficient condition for being nice for forcing in H_κ.

Lemma 4.4. *Let λ be a regular cardinal in V and $\mathsf{P} \subseteq H_\lambda$ be a partial order preserving the regularity of λ. Assume G is V-generic for P. Then*

$$H_\lambda[G] = \{\tau_G : \tau \in V^{\mathsf{P}} \cap H_\lambda\} = H_\lambda^{V[G]}.$$

The above Lemma is rather standard but we sketch a proof since we cannot find a precise reference for it.

Proof. Since every element of H_λ with λ regular is coded with a bounded subset of λ, and P preserve the regularity of κ, we can assume that every P-name for an element of $H_\kappa^{V[G]}$ is coded by a P-name for a function $\dot f : \kappa \to 2$ such that $\dot f$ has value 1 on a bounded subset of κ. In particular we let for any such $\dot f$,

$$D_{\dot f} = \left\{p \in \mathsf{P} :\ \exists \alpha\ p \Vdash \dot f^{-1}[\{1\}] \subseteq \alpha\right\}$$

and for all $\xi < \kappa$,

$$E_{\xi,\dot{f}} = \left\{ p \in \mathsf{P} : \ \exists i < 2 \ \dot{f}(\xi) = i \right\}$$

Notice that $p \in D_{\dot{f}}$ as witnessed by α implies that $p \in E_{\xi,\dot{f}}$ for all $\xi \geq \alpha$. In particular to decide the values of $\dot{f}$ below such conditions p we just need to consider the dense sets $E_{\xi,\dot{f}}$ for $\xi < \alpha$.

Let $p \in \mathsf{P}$ be arbitrary, $A_\xi \subseteq E_{\xi,\dot{f}} \cap D_{\dot{f}}$ be maximal antichains. Since P preserves the regularity of κ, we can find $q \leq p$ such that $q \in D_{\dot{f}}$ as witnessed by α and

$$B_\xi = \{ r \in A_\xi : r \text{ is compatible with } q \}$$

has size less than κ for all $\xi < \alpha$. We can now use these antichains B_ξ to cook up a name $\dot{g}_q \in H_\kappa \cap V^{\mathsf{P}}$ such that q forces that $\dot{f} = \dot{g}_q$. By standard density arguments, the thesis follows. □

Lemma 4.5. *Let $\mathsf{P} \subseteq H_\kappa$ be a partial order preserving the regularity of κ that is definable in $\langle H_\kappa, C \rangle$. Then P is nice for forcing in $\langle H_\kappa, C \rangle$.*

Proof. Since P is a definable class in $\langle H_\kappa, C \rangle$, the corresponding forcing relation $\Vdash_\kappa$ given by formulas with parameters in $H_\kappa \cap V^{\mathsf{P}}$ and whose quantifiers range only over the P-names in H_κ is clearly definable in $\langle H_\kappa, C \rangle$. Moreover, we can prove by induction on ϕ that this relation coincides with the forcing relation as calculated in V, i.e. $p \Vdash \phi^{\dot{H}_\kappa}$ iff $(p \Vdash_\kappa \phi)^{H_\kappa}$. The case ϕ atomic follows from absoluteness of Δ_1 formulas and the case of propositional connectives is easily handled, so we focus on the case $\phi = \exists x \psi(x)$. Using the previous Lemma 4.4,

$$\begin{aligned} p \Vdash \phi^{\dot{H}_\kappa} \ &\Leftrightarrow \ \left\{ q \leq p : \ \exists \tau \in V^{\mathsf{P}} \ q \Vdash \psi(\tau)^{\dot{H}_\kappa} \wedge \tau \in \dot{H}_\kappa \right\} \text{ open dense} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \ \left\{ q \leq p : \ \exists \sigma_q \in H_\kappa \cap V^{\mathsf{P}} \ q \Vdash \psi(\sigma_q)^{\dot{H}_\kappa} \right\} \text{ open dense} \\ &\Leftrightarrow \ (p \Vdash_\kappa \phi)^{H_\kappa} \end{aligned}$$

since the intersection of two open dense sets is open dense. It follows that

$$\begin{aligned} H_\kappa[G] \models \phi \Leftrightarrow H_\kappa^{V[G]} \models \phi \Leftrightarrow V[G] \models \phi^{H_\kappa} \Leftrightarrow \\ \exists p \in G \ p \Vdash \phi^{\dot{H}_\kappa} \Leftrightarrow \exists p \in G \ H_\kappa \models p \Vdash_\kappa \phi \end{aligned}$$

concluding the proof. □

Lemma 4.6 (Lifting Lemma)**.** *Let $\langle M, C \rangle \prec \langle M', C' \rangle$ be models of* ZFC *expanded with an additional class predicate C. Let P be a definable class poset in $\langle M, C \rangle$ that is nice for forcing. Let P' be defined by the same formula in $\langle M', C' \rangle$ (thus replacing C with C') and suppose that P' is also nice for forcing.*

Then for any G $\langle M, C \rangle$-generic for P and G' $\langle M', C' \rangle$-generic for P' such that $G' \cap M = G$, we have that $\langle M, C \rangle[G] \prec \langle M', C' \rangle[G']$.

A proof of the lemma above can be found in [6, Lemma 17]. We remark that since $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ is definable in $\langle V_\kappa, f\rangle$, the above results are applicable to this kind of iteration (even though the $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$ we will be interested with are non-definable classes in V_κ alone).

Theorem 4.7. $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ *is consistent relative to an* (α)*-uplifting cardinal, for any iterable* Γ*.*

Proof. The proof follows the one of [6, Thm. 18]. We prove by induction on α that $\mathsf{P}_\kappa = \mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\Gamma,f}$, the lottery iteration of Γ relative to a function $f : \kappa \to \kappa$, forces $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ whenever f is Menas for (α)-uplifting. By Lemma 3.11, the existence of such an f follows from the existence of an (α)-uplifting cardinal, giving the desired result.

Since $\mathrm{RA}_0(\Gamma)$ holds vacuously true, the thesis holds for $\alpha = 0$. Suppose now that $\alpha > 0$. Let $\dot{\mathsf{Q}} \in V^{\mathsf{P}_\kappa}$ be a name for a forcing in Γ, $\beta < \alpha$ be an ordinal. Using the Menas property for f, let $g : \lambda \to \lambda$ be such that $\langle V_{\kappa+1}, f\rangle \prec_{\Delta^2_1} \langle V_{\lambda+1}, g\rangle$, $g(\kappa) \geq \mathrm{rank}(\dot{\mathsf{Q}})$ and g is a Menas for (β)-uplifting function on λ. Let $\mathsf{P}_\lambda = \mathsf{P}_\lambda^{\Gamma,g}$ be the lottery iteration of Γ relative to g.

By inductive hypothesis, P_λ forces $\mathrm{RA}_\beta(\Gamma)$ and by elementarity $g \restriction \kappa = f$ so that P_κ is an initial part of P_λ. Furthermore, by Theorem 1.8 P_κ is $<\kappa$-cc and P_λ is $<\lambda$-cc, hence by Lemma 4.5 they are both nice for forcing and don't push the continuum above their size ($V^{\mathsf{P}_\kappa} \models \mathfrak{c} \leq \kappa$, $V^{\mathsf{P}_\lambda} \models \mathfrak{c} \leq \lambda$).

Let G be any V-generic filter for P_κ, H be a $V[G]$-generic filter for $\mathrm{val}_G(\dot{\mathsf{Q}})$. Since $g(\kappa) \geq \mathrm{rank}(\dot{\mathsf{Q}})$, $\dot{\mathsf{Q}}$ is one of the elements of the lottery sum considered at stage $\kappa + 1$ so that $G * H$ is V-generic for $\mathsf{P}_\lambda \restriction (\kappa + 1)$. Let G' be $V[G * H]$-generic for P_λ.

Since P_κ, P_λ are nice for forcing in the respective models and $\langle H_\kappa, f\rangle \prec \langle H_\lambda, f\rangle$ we can apply Lemma 4.6 to obtain $H_\kappa[G] \prec H_\lambda[G * H * G']$. Thus by Lemma 4.4 we have that $H_\kappa^{V[G]} = H_\kappa[G] \prec H_\lambda[G * H * G'] = H_\lambda^{V[G*H*G']}$. Since $\mathfrak{c} \leq \kappa$ in $V[G]$ and $\mathfrak{c} \leq \lambda$ in $V[G * H * G']$, we can restrict the relation above to obtain that $H_\mathfrak{c}^{V[G]} \prec H_\mathfrak{c}^{V[G*H*G']}$ concluding the proof. □

In the previous theorem one notable case was excluded, i.e. $\Gamma = \mathsf{SSP}$. The best known upper bound for the consistency strength of $\mathrm{RA}(\mathsf{SSP})$ is given in [15, Thm. 3.1] where it is shown that in the presence of class many Woodin cardinals MM^{++} implies $\mathrm{RA}(\mathsf{SSP})$ (according to Hamkins and Johnstone's terminology), although it is not clear how this result can be generalized to the axioms $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ we introduced. We know that MM^{++} can be forced by a semiproper iteration to get SPFA and $\mathsf{SP} = \mathsf{SSP}$. For $\mathrm{RA}_\alpha(\mathsf{SSP})$ a similar idea has to be applied iteratively, in order to ensure that after each resurrection the equality $\mathsf{SP} = \mathsf{SSP}$ still holds. This led to the definition of $\mathrm{RFA}^{++}_\alpha(\Gamma)$ that was given in Section 2.

Furthermore, we cannot directly generalize the previous result to the SSP-case: a function f that is Menas for (α)-uplifting for supercompacts

defined in analogy to the one in Lemma 3.11, might fail to produce a lottery iteration $\mathsf{P}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SP},f}$ that forces MM^{++}. Thus, in order to prove a consistency upper bound for RFA$_\alpha^{++}(\mathsf{SSP})$ we will change slightly the approach, replacing the lottery iteration with the category forcing $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ introduced in [17].

Theorem 4.8. RFA$_\alpha^{++}(\mathsf{SSP})$ *is consistent relative to an* (α)*-uplifting for supercompacts cardinal.*

Proof. We prove by induction on α that $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$, the category forcing of height κ, forces RFA$_\alpha^{++}(\mathsf{SSP})$ whenever κ is (α)-uplifting for supercompacts. Since RFA$_0^{++}(\mathsf{SSP})$ holds vacuously true, the thesis holds for $\alpha = 0$.

Suppose now that $\alpha > 0$. Let $\dot{\mathbb{Q}} \in V^{\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}}$ be a name for a forcing in SSP, $\beta < \alpha$ be an ordinal. Since κ is (α)-uplifting for supercompacts, let $\lambda > \mathrm{rank}(\dot{\mathbb{Q}})$ be a (β)-uplifting for supercompacts cardinal such that $V_{\kappa+1} \prec_{\Delta_1^2} V_{\lambda+1}$. By inductive hypothesis, $\mathbb{U}_\lambda^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ forces RFA$_\beta^{++}(\mathsf{SSP})$, and by [17, Thm. 3.6] it forces also MM^{++}.

Let G be any V-generic filter for $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$, H be a $V[G]$-generic filter for $\mathrm{val}_G(\dot{\mathbb{Q}})$. Since $\lambda \geq \mathrm{rank}(\dot{\mathbb{Q}})$, $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}} * \dot{\mathbb{Q}}$ is in $\mathbb{U}_\lambda^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ hence by [17, Thm. 3.16, Lemma 3.13] there is a G' such that $G * H * G'$ is generic for $\mathbb{U}_\lambda^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ with $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}} * \dot{\mathbb{Q}} \in G * H * G'$.

By [17, Lemma 3.20], $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ preserves the regularity of κ, hence by Lemma 4.5 $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ is nice for forcing in H_κ. Then we can apply Lemma 4.6 to obtain $H_\kappa[G] \prec H_\lambda[G * H * G']$.

Furthermore, since $\mathbb{U}_\kappa^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ preserves the regularity of κ and $\mathbb{U}_\lambda^{\mathsf{SSP}}$ preserves the regularity of λ, we have that $H_\kappa[G] = H_\kappa^{V[G]}$ and $H_\lambda[G * H * G'] = H_\lambda^{V[G*H*G']}$. Finally, by [17, Thm. 3.21] $\kappa = \omega_2 = \mathfrak{c}$ in $V[G]$ and $\lambda = \omega_2 = \mathfrak{c}$ in $V[G * H * G']$, so that $H_\mathfrak{c}^{V[G]} \prec H_\mathfrak{c}^{V[G*H*G']}$ concluding the proof. □

4.3 Iterated resurrection and size of the continuum

In [6] it is proved that wRA(Γ) implies $\mathfrak{c} \leq \omega_2$ for any $\Gamma \ni \mathrm{Coll}(\omega_1, \omega_2)$, and that RA(all) implies CH while RA(ccc) implies that $\mathfrak{c}$ is weakly inaccessible.

In the last subsection we showed that RA$_\alpha(\Gamma)$ is compatible with FA(Γ) (which in many cases imply $\mathfrak{c} = \omega_2$). However, the iterated resurrection axiom is also compatible with CH for most Γ.

Theorem 4.9. RA$_\alpha(\Gamma)$ + CH *is consistent relative to* RA$_\alpha(\Gamma)$*, for any* Γ *closed under two-step iteration and such that* $\mathrm{Add}(\omega_1, 1) \in \Gamma$.

Proof. The proof is obtained by induction on α, following [6, Thm. 6] with minor adjustments. □

References

[1] Carolin Antos. Class-forcing in class theory. arXiv:1503.00116, 2015.

[2] Joan Bagaria. Bounded forcing axioms as principles of generic absoluteness. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 39(6):393–401, 2000.

[3] James E. Baumgartner. Iterated forcing. In *Surveys in set theory*, volume 87 of *London Math. Soc. Lecture Note Ser.*, pages 1–59. Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 1983.

[4] Mohamed Bekkali. *Topics in set theory*, volume 1476 of *Lecture Notes in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1991. Lebesgue measurability, large cardinals, forcing axioms, rho-functions, Notes on lectures by Stevo Todorčević.

[5] Joel David Hamkins. The lottery preparation. *Ann. Pure Appl. Logic*, 101(2-3):103–146, 2000.

[6] Joel David Hamkins and Thomas A. Johnstone. Resurrection axioms and uplifting cardinals. *Arch. Math. Logic*, 53(3-4):463–485, 2014.

[7] Thomas Jech. *Set theory*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003. The third millennium edition, revised and expanded.

[8] Akihiro Kanamori. *The higher infinite*. Springer Monographs in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 2003. Large cardinals in set theory from their beginnings.

[9] Alexander S. Kechris. *Classical descriptive set theory*, volume 156 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995.

[10] Kenneth Kunen. *Set theory*, volume 34 of *Studies in Logic (London)*. College Publications, London, 2011.

[11] Paul B. Larson. *The stationary tower*, volume 32 of *University Lecture Series*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2004. Notes on a course by W. Hugh Woodin.

[12] Telis K. Menas. On strong compactness and supercompactness. *Ann. Math. Logic*, 7:327–359, 1974/75.

[13] Itay Neeman and Jindřich Zapletal. Proper forcings and absoluteness in $L(\mathbf{R})$. *Comment. Math. Univ. Carolin.*, 39(2):281–301, 1998.

[14] Saharon Shelah. *Proper and improper forcing*. Perspectives in Mathematical Logic. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, second edition, 1998.

[15] Konstantinos Tsaprounis. On resurrection axioms. in preparation, 2013.

[16] Matteo Viale. Martin's maximum revisited. arXiv:1110.1181 (to appear in Archive for Mathematical Logic), 2011.

[17] Matteo Viale. Category forcings, MM^{+++}, and generic absoluteness for the theory of strong forcing axioms. arXiv:1305.2058, 2013.

[18] Matteo Viale, Giorgio Audrito, and Silvia Steila. A boolean algebraic approach to semiproper iterations. arXiv:1402.1714, 2014.